DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 048 847 JC 710 085

AUTHOR Case, Chester H.
TITLE Establishing Academic Senates in California Community Colleges.
PUB DATE Feb 71
NOTE 58p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Faculty Organizations, *Governance, *Junior Colleges, *Teacher Administrator Relationship, *Teacher Associations, Teacher Participation, Teacher Responsibility
IDENTIFIERS *California

ABSTRACT

This report, a description and analysis of the early formation period of the academic senate movement in California community colleges, is a portion of a larger study conducted in 1967. Responses from senate presidents provided a large measure of the data on problems and issues of forming a senate. Legal enactments from Sacramento in 1963, 1964, and 1967 gave legitimacy, focus, direction, and impetus to the academic senate movement. By 1967, faculty participation had been accomplished. Once a decision was made to establish a faculty senate, the following problem areas had to be considered: definition of power, membership in the senate, its structure, its purposes, its operating procedures, and its general role in college governance. (CA)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION
& WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED048847

ESTABLISHING ACADEMIC SENATES IN CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Chester H. Case
University of California, Berkeley
February, 1971

JC 710 085

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

APR 26 1971

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

Preface

The decade of the Sixties was one of growth and change for the community colleges of California. Among the important trends to emerge during this period was the movement toward wider participation by faculties in decision making and policy formulation. This trend found expression in such developments as an enlarging role for the faculty member in the college committee structure, the growth in size and influence of instructor's organizations, and in the emergence of the academic senate as a part of college governance.

In 1967, this writer set out to describe and analyze the thriving academic senate movement. Since very little had been written on senates at the time, an attempt was made for comprehensiveness in description and analysis by means of a two phase study. One phase focused on the larger, historical and statewide aspect of senate development. Basic to this phase was a questionnaire administered to the presidents of the senates or councils, throughout the state. Seventy percent of the presidents responded, most helpfully. The second phase was designed to bring the focus in sharper on the operations, structures, and products of senates by closely studying three case study colleges (Merritt College, Laney College, and Diablo Valley College). Data was gathered at the case study colleges by means of questionnaires, interviews, analysis of documents and extensive field observation.

The two phase research project yielded a wealth of data, which has been elsewhere analyzed and interpreted at length.*

This paper is that portion of the larger study which describes and analyzes the early, formation period of the academic senate movement. Responses from the senate presidents provide a large measure of the data. (As the responses of the senate presidents on topics other than the problems and issues of forming a senate will be of historical as well as continuing interest, summaries of responses on other questionnaire items are included in an appendix. Limitations of time and space preclude interpretation of the data in the appendix, but it is hoped they will be informative to the reader as they stand.)

With the advent of the Seventies, there is no apparent slackening of the pace of growth and change. There have been shifts in focus and intensity of concern and new trends have emerged. Indications are that some potent trends of the Sixties have run their course, others have leveled off, while others continue to run strong. The movement toward wider faculty participation is one of the latter. For instance, senate movement has moved into another phase with the creation of a statewide senate. On the local level, faculty members find their role being continually enlarged as they acquire new or redefined rights and responsibilities.

Perhaps, it is time to again assess the senate movement in California. This paper is offered for whatever assistance it may provide in that endeavor, with special gratitude to the senate, or council presidents of 1967 who responded so generously with their time and intelligence to an exceedingly detailed questionnaire.

* Case, Chester H., "Faculty Participation in the Governance of Junior Colleges: A Study of Academic Senates in California Public Junior Colleges," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1968.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PREFACE.	i
LIST OF TABLES.	iv
ESTABLISHING ACADEMIC SENATES IN CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES	
Introduction.	1
Framework of Legal Provisions.	1
ACR 48: Product and Producer..	2
ACR 48: Its Passage and Content.	3
A Year of Study and Debate: 1963-1964.	6
Section 131.6: Its Content.	9
The Timely Catalysts, ACR 48 and Section 131.6.	11
Revision, Spring 1967.	12
Senate Making Throughout California.	19
Advice from Senate Presidents.	19
Problem Areas.	22
Membership in the Senate.	23
Structure of the Senate.	24
Purposes of the Senate.	25
Reflections on the Metaphor "Voice of the Faculty"	29
Procedures.	31
Procedures of Concern to Faculties.	33
Models for Senate Making.	34
Opinions of Senate Presidents on the Role of the Senate in the Governance of the College. .	35
Conclusion and Implications.	38
Appendix.	40

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Establishment of Senates by Year	11
2.	Eligibility to Run for Senate	23
3.	Senate Structure	24
4.	Responses of Senate Presidents to the Question: "What Provisions are in Your Constitution, By-Laws, Standing Rules for the Regulation of Senate Procedures?"	32
5.	Senate Presidents' Judgments on Senate Procedures and Practices That Concern Their Faculties	33
6.	Models Influential in Development of Senate Structure and Procedures	35
7.	Opinions of Senate Presidents on the Question, "What Do You Feel Should Be the Role of the Academic Senate in the Total Government of the College?"	36
8.	Opinions of Senate Presidents on the Relationships Between Administration and Academic Senates	37
9.	Predictions of Senate Presidents Concerning Academic Senates, Departments, and Professional Organizations	41
10.	Areas of Committee Assignment and Concern, State-Wide	42
11.	Preferences by Faculties and State-Wide Presidents for the "Style" of the Senate President	43
12.	Preferences Expressed by the Three College Faculties and State-Wide Presidents on the Role of the Senator	43
13.	Predictions of the Faculties of the Three Colleges and State-Wide Presidents on the Statement: "Service as a Senator will Become a Conventional Stepping-Stone to Administrative Positions"	44

Table

Page

14. Predictions of the Three College Faculties and State-Wide Senate Presidents on the Statement: "The Status of Senator Will Be Increasingly Important and Sought After By Faculty Members..... 44

15. Responses of Faculty and Statewide Presidents to the Prediction: "Academic Senates Will Become Dominated by Oligarchies"..... 44

16. Senate Presidents' Judgments on the Appropriateness of Certain Topics as Senate Business..... 45

17. Preference of Faculty Members Among Channels for Making Influence Felt in Policy Formulation and Decision Making.. 46

18. Attitudes of Faculty Members Toward Their Senate and Its Activities..... 46

19. Opinions of the Three College Faculties on the Degree of Freedom the Senate Should Have In Speaking for the Faculty..... 47

20. Attitudes of High School Experienced and Non-High School Experienced Faculty Members Toward the Senate and its Activities..... 48

21. Attitudes of Liberal Arts and Technical-Vocational Faculty Members Toward the Senate and Its Activities..... 49

22. Attitudes Toward the Senate and Its Activities By Tenured and Non-Tenured Faculty Members..... 50

23. Preferences of Faculty Members on the Question, "Whom Would You Choose To Evaluate Your Instructional Competence?"..... 51

24. Preference for the Utilization of Free Time by Faculties of the Three Colleges..... 52

Introduction

Important for an understanding of the senate movement is a knowledge of that framework of legal provisions which fixes the stamp of legitimacy upon the authority of the senates and exerts pressures shaping individual senates in form as well as function. This chapter will first consider these legal provisions, then turn to an overview of certain processes and issues of senate making as reported by senate presidents. Thereafter the focus will be directed for the remainder of the study upon the primary case study senate and the two comparison senates.

Framework of Legal Provisions

At three points in time, critically important enactments emanated from the state government in Sacramento to give legitimation, focus, direction, and impetus to the academic senate movement. The first came in 1963 in the instance of Assembly Concurrent Resolution 48 (hereinafter referred to as ACR 48). Next came the 1964 enactment of the

State Board of Education when it promulgated Title 5, California Administrative Code, Section 131.6 (hereinafter referred to as Sec. 131.6). Most recent, in 1967, have been the amendment and deletions in Sec. 131.6 by the State Board of Education (hereinafter referred to as the Spring 1967 Revisions).

The full history of these signal enactments cannot be recounted here. But because these enactments set the broad context within which individual local senates have evolved, it is necessary to examine their content and to identify the salient issues and actors involved in their passage.

ACR 48: Product and Producer

For several years prior to the passage of ACR 48 in 1963, pressure for enlarged faculty participation in the governance of the junior college had been steadily mounting. These pressures converged to produce ACR 48. In turn, by the model for faculty participation it conveyed, ACR 48 to a certain extent produced the academic senate movement. Upon passage of ACR 48, the academic senate movement began its swift course of progress.

As was noted in Chapter I,* the pressures for enlarged faculty participation was broad-fronted and sprang from many sources. ACR 48 was elicited by the convergence of these pressures. The resolution, infused with the considerable power of legislative approbation, channeled the pressure for

* Case, Chester H., "Faculty Participation in the Governance of Junior Colleges: A Study of Academic Senates in California Public Junior Colleges," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1968.

legitimated, formal faculty participation toward the model of the academic senate. Other modes of faculty participation, of course, continued in their own evolution. But the rapid proliferation of senates attests to the intrinsic appeal of the concept and the extent to which faculty members devoted their energies to senate making.

ACR 48: Its Passage and Content

Assemblyman Ben Garrigus, Chairman of the Assembly Education Committee, and junior college instructor, introduced ACR 48 in April of the 1963 legislative session. A lead role in the formulation of the language was played by Mr. William Plosser, legislative advocate of the California Federation of Teachers.[1] The other major junior college instructors' organizations also had great interest in the measure and, in an unusual show of accord, joined in an advocacy for the resolution.[2] By May 1963, ACR 48 had cleared both houses.

The resolution directed the State Board of Education to provide for the

> . . . establishment at each junior college of an academic senate or council wherein the faculty members shall be freely selected by their colleagues

---

[1]Conversation with Mr. Plosser, Sacramento, March 31, 1967.

[2]California Junior College Faculty Association, Bulletin, October 1963, and California Teachers Association, Action, September 1964.

> for the purpose of representing them in the formation of policy on academic and professional matters.

The "whereases" of the resolution set forth some of the important grounds for the argument for enlarged faculty participation. Because they served subsequently as the source for much of the justification later urged for the establishment of senates, these whereases are quoted here at length:

> Whereas, It is traditional that faculty members in institutions of higher learning participate in policy formation on academic and professional matters . . . through academic senates and councils; and
>
> Whereas, The master plan recognizes the junior colleges as an integral part of the system of higher education in California; and
>
> Whereas, The trustees of the state colleges have established a statewide faculty senate thereby leaving the junior college system the only remaining member of the tripartite master plan for higher education without such a faculty organization; and
>
> Whereas, Junior colleges are to be organized and administered as a separate and independent system of higher education under the State Board of Education; . . .[3]

Of course, the passage of ACR 48 provoked forebodings from some quarters. Negative prophecies were heard. Faculties, it was said, would soon lose their enthusiasm once they had experienced the wearisome burdens of "responsible" participation. Or, senates would degenerate into glorified debating societies; the governance of the colleges would be paralyzed

---

[3]See Appendix A for a reproduction of ACR 48.

by the inescapable sluggishness inherent in deliberative bodies; ultimately faculty oligarchies (probably based in the liberal arts faculty members) would capture the senate and make it their citadel, using its authority to override other segments of the college.

Positive prophecies were also heard. ACR 48 was heralded as the "Magna Carta" of faculty participation. It was predicted that senates would vastly improve the quality of decisions and policies, that senates would soon find effective, efficient modus operandi, that the presence of the senate at a college would be the sign and seal of bona fide higher education status.

Some truth probably resided in each of the prophecies. Nevertheless, the message of ACR 48 was that the concept of faculty participation had been legitimated by no less an authority than the legislature, with details to follow. For several colleges, the message arrived on a scene where developments had already brought senate-like entities into existence. For some others, the message told of a way to circumvent local administrations and boards which had steadfastly refused to countenance formal faculty participation. For the bulk of the colleges, the passage was a "go ahead" to commence the task of senate making.

A Year of Debate and Study: 1963-1964

Upon passage of ACR 48, faculty participation became a topic of widespread concern. Said a junior college leader: "A topic which involved extended study . . . by board, junior colleges, administrators and faculties over the entire state dealt with faculty participation in local policy determination."[4]

Although the debate on senates was extensive and thorough, on the whole, it was not so acrimonious as might have been suggested by the fact that an old order was changing and a new one emerging. Observed Tillery in retrospect, "Debate on the role of Junior College teachers in policy making has been intense but remarkably mature."[5]

Directed to provide for the establishment of senates, but wanting in specifics on how to do so, the State Board of Education instructed Dr. Emil Toews, Director of the Junior College Bureau, to study the matter, gather advice from concerned parties, and present recommendations. The study which he launched left virtually no source of advice untapped.

In the meantime, the professional organizations contributed to the "Great Debate" by holding workshops, and

---

[4]Henry T. Tyler, "Full Partners in California's Higher Education," Junior College Journal, XXXV (March, 1965), 6.

[5]H. Dale Tillery, "California Junior College Education," in A Consideration of Issues Affecting Aclifornia Public Junior Colleges, a Report of California State Coordinating Council for Higher Education, Sacramento, April, 1965, p. 27.

developing guidelines for the senate makers in regard to composition, structures, and procedures.

That the winds of change were blowing was signaled by the nature of the topics discussed at the October 1963 meeting of the California Junior College Association, for long a straightforward administrators' organization. Pressures to accommodate faculty participation had already been manifested in the restructuring of the CJCA, on both the state-wide and regional levels to include faculty members on the Board of Directors, as well as officers.[6]

The theme of the meeting was "Major Issues Facing California Junior Colleges," and high on the agenda was the topic "The Junior College Faculty Senate--Representation with Responsibility." Faculty representation at the meeting was large. "An unusual feature compared with past conferences," noted the conference report, "was the large turn-out of the presidents of local faculty associations."[7]

The faculty presidents were organized into a Faculty Officers Section. Meeting as a group, they exerted by their votes an important influence on what was to be the eventual content of Sec. 131.6. A series of four questions was put to

---

[6]William P. Niland, "Faculty-Administration Conflict in California Public Junior Colleges: An Analysis and a Proposal for Resolution" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1964), p.7.

[7]California Junior College Association, Proceedings, Fall 1963 Conference, October 29-31, San Diego, p. 1.

them by a faculty leader from Southern California. They cast an affirmative vote for each of the questions:

1. Do you want a mandate from the State Board of Education requiring local boards of trustees to recognize the faculty senate in each junior college?

2. Should the requirements in any State Board rules and regulations be general in nature rather than specific?

3. Should there be a provision in the State Board rules and regulations that the senate should have direct access to the Board of Trustees in addition to, as well as, the president of the college?

4. Should there be a requirement that the faculty senate be limited in its membership to full-time faculty members holding positions not requiring an Administrative Credential?[8]

It will be shown later that the substance of these recommendations, which the CJCA caused to be disseminated throughout the state for study, was to be reflected in Sec. 131.6.

Later, guided by the thinking of the many parties he consulted, Dr. Toews synthesized a set of recommendations for the Board. By now, a new academic year was impending. To the Board, a need for haste in complying with the directive of ACR 48 had become apparent; many faculties had undertaken to proceed with senate making under the vague auspices of ACR 48, but others were waiting in a state of confusion, pending clarification as to just what the authorizations for senates would be.

---

[8] Ibid., p. 4.

At its September 1964 meeting, the Board determined that a "state of emergency" existed.[9] After hearing statements and arguments on Toews' recommendations, and after some inevitable compromising, the Board enacted Sec. 131.6. The second signal enactment had been promulgated and the academic senate movement was now an irreversible fact.

Section 131.6: Its Content

Important definitions and indispensable authorizations were set forth in Sec. 131.6.[10] Faculty was defined as:

> certificated persons who teach full time in a junior college or other full time certificated persons who do not perform any services for the college that require an administrative or supervisory credential.

This definition was established to designate who of the college would be entitled to vote on the question of setting up a senate, although the definition has also been used to define eligibility for membership in the senate.

Academic senate, or faculty council, was taken to mean:

> . . . an organization formed in accordance with this section whose primary function is, as representative of the faculty, to make recommendations to the administration and governing board of a school district with respect to academic and professional matters.

---

[9]California State Board of Education, Minutes of the State Board of Education, September 10-11, 1964, pp. 8829-30.

[10]See Appendix B for a reproduction of Sec. 131.6.

The intention in providing for senates was:

> In order that the faculty may have a formal and effective procedure for participating in the formation of district policies on academic and professional matters.

To establish senates, the faculty was granted the right to hold an election to determine whether one was wanted. If so, the governing board was directed to establish such an academic senate, or faculty council, by authorizing the faculty to:

> Fix, and amend, by vote of the faculty, the composition, structure, and procedures of the academic senate or council.
>
> Select, in accordance with accepted democratic election procedures, the members of the academic senate or faculty council.

The operating prerogatives of a duly established senate were set forth in the following language (subparagraphs c and d, later to be amended):

> The academic senate or faculty council shall present its written views and recommendations to the governing board through regularly established channels. However, the senate or council, after consultation with administration, may present its views and recommendations directly to the governing board.
>
> The governing board shall consider such views and recommendations. It may entertain oral presentation thereof by the senate or council at any board meeting.

Though time and experience would soon reveal shortcomings in these mandates (largely in the faculty view), they served to stimulate the swift progress of the senate movement.

The Timely Catalysts, ACR 48 and Section 131.6

The catalytic effect of ACR 48 and Sec. 131.6 is clearly seen in the coincidence of their enactments and the establishment of senates.

Responses from academic senate presidents on the state-wide questionnaire show that the dates of the enactment mark the beginnings of the rapid movement toward the establishment of senates, with the burst of activity in 1964 continuing into 1965. The years of establishments are shown in Table 6.

TABLE 1

ESTABLISHMENT OF SENATES BY YEAR
(N=53)

1962 and before		1963		1964		1965		1966		1967	
No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
3	6	5	10	17	32	18	34	7	13	3	6

A survey conducted in 1965 by the California Teachers Association showed that 46 per cent of the colleges had held elections to establish senates (not to install them) after the passage of ACR 48 but prior to the action of the State Board on Sec. 131.6.[11] After the promulgation of Sec. 131.6,

[11] California Teachers Association, Junior College "Academic Senate" Survey, October, 1965, CTA, Burlingame.

52 per cent of the colleges held elections to establish senates.

Revision, Spring 1967

Under the stimulus of ACR 48 and Sec. 131.6, senates appeared throughout the state. As might be expected, the course of development for each individual senate proceeded at a different rate, in different directions. Some faculties had forged ahead to make their senates viable instruments for authoritative, formal faculty participation. Others had fallen short of this. By 1967, a knowledgeable observer generalized about the development of senates:

> They range from glorified curriculum committees to organizations intensely involved with budget, selection of staff, every detail of organization, some concern with salary, fringe benefits, etc. . . .[12]

The variability among senates resulted in large part from local circumstances. But it was also felt, especially by the CJCFA, that the development of senates had been impaired by shortcomings and ambiguities in the language of Sec. 131.6, as well as by complications that had arisen from the passage of the Winton Bill, a measure which established, as an instrument of faculty participation, negotiating councils for primary and secondary schools. This measure had spilled over onto the junior college, and appeared to be in conflict

---

[12]California State Board of Education, Junior College Advisory Panel, Minutes of Meeting, March 31-April 1, 1967, Sacramento, p. 17.

with the intent and language of Sec. 131.6.

The CJCFA singled out those problems they felt were in need of redress and, in the practice increasingly employed by faculty groups, took their appeal directly to Sacramento.[13] In response to their request, the State Board of Education directed its Junior College Advisory Panel to "consider the workings of academic senates, or faculty councils" in order to make recommendations for action on pressing problems.[14]

The Executive Secretary of the JCAP began to gather evidence on the situation. Subsequently, he narrowed the matter down to four salient problems.[15] The first problem, which was to consume the bulk of the meeting time of the JCAP, was the overlap and conflict between Sec. 131.6 and the Winton Bill. The CJCFA wished to have the junior colleges exempted from the provisions of the Winton Bill but was opposed by the CTA. The California Federation of Teachers expressed a desire to repeal the Winton Bill altogether.

Another problem stemmed from the language of Sec. 131.6, which appeared to preclude the establishment of

---

[13]Letter to Mr. James W. Keene, Executive Secretary, Junior College Advisory Panel, State Board of Education, from Richard Fairchild, Chairman, Academic Senate Liaison Committee, California Junior College Faculty Association, dated Nov. 4, 1966.

[14]California State Board of Education, Junior College Advisory Panel, "Background Material on Academic Senates and Negotiating Councils," March 22, 1967, Sacramento, p. 4. (Mimeographed.)

[15]Ibid.

district-wide senates in multi-campus districts. A third problem reflected the ambiguity in the legal status of the academic senate. The problem lay in defining the extent of the senate entitlement to legal opinions from the county counsel, and the entitlement of duly elected senate officers and members of senates to work on senate business on "college time."

These problems were examined exhaustively. Testimony was heard from representatives of faculty and other junior college groups, as well as from junior college leaders and former legislators, including Mr. Winton and Mr. Garrigus.[16]

Resolutions were passed at each meeting recommending actions for the State Board to take. Considered together, these resolutions (when enacted by the State Board) had the effect of lending further strength and support to the senate concept, although not to the complete satisfaction of the CJCFA.

At the conclusion of its first session, the JCAP recommended that the State Board make clear by resolution that district-wide senates were legal and within the intent of Sec. 131.6, that local boards should assist senates which might seek the legal advice of county counsels, and that

---

[16]California State Board of Education, Junior College Advisory Panel, Minutes of Meeting, March 31-April 1, 1967, and Minutes of Meeting, April 28, 1967. These verbatim proceedings are an invaluable source on the evolution of the academic senate movement, and provide an excellent insight into the issues and actors involved.

senates be regarded as a part of the regular part of the operation of the college. In regard to the latter point, they said:

> It is the view of the State Board of Education that the conduct of academic senate business as a regular part of the operation of the junior college is entirely appropriate and that the extent of staff time and effort assigned this function is clearly a matter for determination by the local board of trustees.[17]

At its second meeting, the JCAP resumed consideration of the problems examined at the previous session. Concerning the overlap and conflict between the Winton Bill and the academic senate, it resolved, in a compromise, not to support the exemption of the junior colleges from the Winton Bill, but to strengthen senates "to the extent that they operate on a par with negotiating councils."[18]

Another recommendation held that academic senates need to be established pursuant to statute law, rather than having their authorization in the Administrative Code, which would give them added strength.

As had emerged in the deliberations of the panel, the language of Sec. 131.6 was considered to be inadequate in establishing what were the rights of the senate in regard to

---

[17]Letter of transmittal reporting resolutions of the Junior College Advisory Panel to Dr. Max Rafferty, Superintendent of Public Instruction, from James W. Keene, Executive Secretary, Junior College Advisory Panel, dated April 3, 1967.

[18]Junior College Advisory Panel, Minutes of Meeting, April 28, 1967, Resolution (enclosure).

access to the governing board, and the extent of obligation upon the governing board to respond to the senate's communications. The JCAP formulated recommendations which were subsequently adopted by the State Board and amended into Sec. 131.6. Since they replaced the previous sections (subparagraphs c and d), they are reported here in full with the phrases critical in clarifying and strengthening the role of senates italicized (italics added by the writer):

> After consultation with the administration, the academic senate or faculty council may present its written views and recommendations to the governing board. The governing board shall consider and respond to such views and recommendations.
>
> When requested, the governing board, or such board members or administrative officers as it may designate, shall meet and confer with representatives of the academic senate or faculty council with respect to recommendations made by the senate or council. The designation of board members or administrative officers as provided herein shall not preclude the representatives of an academic senate or a faculty council from meeting with, appearing before, or making proposals to the governing board at a public meeting, if the academic senate or faculty council requests such a public meeting.

An addition was made to the section, as follows:

> The academic senates or faculty councils may assume such responsibilities and perform such functions as may be requested of it by the administration and/or board of trustees.[19]

In the first two amendments, the phrases "shall meet and confer" and "shall consider and respond" stressed the rights of access to the board by the senate, ensured a hearing, and generally strengthened the authorizations of the

---

[19]See Appendix C for a reproduction of the resolutions sent by the JCAP to the State Board of Education as a result of its deliberations.

senate.

Although the pressure for revision and clarification indicated that Sec. 131.6 was considered less than a perfect instrument, it did have the effect of creating an opening through which could flow the pressure for legitimated, formal, and enlarged faculty role in policy formation and decision making. The effect of the mandate was to put a floor under faculty participation rather than a ceiling over it. Where and when the ceiling would be reached by an individual senate depended, of course, on what a faculty could do in the face of local circumstances.

But perhaps the most portentous long-range implication of ACR 48 and Sec. 131.6 was that a new force had arrived in the processes of decision making and policy formation at a time when junior colleges faced the task of making many critical decisions. The grim forebodings of harm and misuse of faculty power had not been totally dispelled--the intransigent oligarchy, the threat to the open door, deadlocks arising from chronic conflict, inability of the college to respond to pressures for change--but one keen analyst concluded that the arrival of the faculty member would redound to the betterment of the college. He said:

> . . . it seems likely that California Junior Colleges have immeasurably strengthened the means by which they may arrive at intelligent decisions at a time of crisis in education. The professional knowledge and experience of teachers should enhance the dedication and institutional view which characterize many

> Junior College administrators and trustees. The going may be rough, but those who are concerned with the continued development of an institution which is something other than a reflection of university education might appreciate this new vitality at the local level rather than interfere with it.

He concluded:

> The great experiment is under way and there will continue to be debate about the implications of the new faculty role for Junior College objectives and for the big questions about who gets educated and how.[20]

The framework of legal provisions developed in the four-year period beginning with the passage of ACR 48 in 1963 up to Spring 1967 revisions can be characterized as both the producer and the product of the academic senate movement. The initial impact of ACR 48 was to catalyze the movement, and to hold up a powerfully attractive model for formal faculty participation (the academic senate) which had about it the aura of traditions and conventions of faculty governance as they were supposed to exist in the senior colleges and universities, traditions and conventions hallowed by what was taken to be a long history with origins in the ancient universities of medieval Europe. The impact of Sec. 131.6 and subsequent revisions was to legitimate faculty authority (with important restrictions still present, however). Faculty participation, by 1967, was an accomplished fact.

---

[20]Tillery, op. cit., p. 28.

Senate Making Throughout California

The translation of the broad mandates of Sec. 131.6 into the reality of an operating senate involved much work. Once the decision had been made by faculty vote to establish a senate, then the hard questions of specifications in regard to structure, membership, procedures, and definition of powers and purposes had to be answered. Those answers, to be formalized in the "compact" of a constitution by a faculty as well as those "understandings" hammered out in debate, would have an important influence on the form and style of faculty participation at any given college.

Advice from Senate Presidents

It has already been observed that the outcome of senate making throughout the state of California resulted in the establishment of senates that resembled "glorified curriculum committees," as well as senates that took on vital, large roles in the governance of the college. Regardless, however, of the variability of the senates and the individual circumstances of the college in which they evolved, it appears that certain common problems faced constitution makers throughout the state.

The range of these problems can be inferred from the responses of senate presidents to the questionnaire item which asked, "If you were asked to advise a brand new junior college on the creation of an academic senate, what would be your

principal recommendations?" Some of the responses are reported to give an indication of the background problems.

By way of paving the way for the creation of a senate, several presidents advised:

> Persuade the Board of Trustees that through the Senate's work the Board can keep itself involved with the issues and thinking which a college faculty generates. The Board cannot be an effective governing Board without an organization like the senate. The senate helps put into the minds of board members concepts, information and points of view which the Board has to have if it is to escape becoming a rubber stamp of administrative officers.

\- - -

> First sell the governing board on the value of a senate--that it does not intend to take away any of the functions of the board or administration.

\- - -

> I would advise them to find out what sort of senate the faculty and administration would truly honor.

\- - -

> Discuss the idea thoroughly with all faculty, administrators and Board members.

\- - -

> Do <u>not</u> start <u>any</u> other organizations the first year.

In regard to the shaping of the senate:

> All faculty members should have representation.

\- - -

> . . . Keep the organizational structure as <u>simple</u> as possible! . . . Avoid head-on confrontations with the Board and/or Administration during the organizational stage. . . . Don't let cliques dominate the organizing; include all the faculty and staff.

\- - -

Make a representative senate. Set aside a block of time in college scheduling for senate meetings. Educate faculty and administration to purposes of a model senate.

- - -

If a small school the idea of having all faculty members be members of the senate is of great help.

- - -

Make use of committee structure to involve as many faculty members as possible. Limit the terms of office of the officers of the Senate to avoid any faction of the faculty [gaining] control of the Senate.

- - -

That its constitution be carefully and clearly written.

- - -

Don't tie it up in detailed procedural requirements.

On the role of the senate, this advice was offered:

That the senate make its role as a policy recommending body as opposed to a grievance committee very clear and implement this role through senate-administration cooperation.

- - -

Make the senate a vital part of the college. Give it status, give it authority and responsibility.--Give it financing.

- - -

That faculty . . . with senate as its representative, be made equal partner with administration before the governing board in recommending policy.

- - -

Strive to educate the faculty to become more involved with school affairs outside the classroom, e.g., budget and finance . . . curriculum development, student affairs.

As to getting under way, one suggestion was: "Elect your most competent, courageous faculty."

A final comment:

> Write a good, well-conceived constitution which . . . is tailored to the history and needs of the particular school. Then select damned good and concerned people.

Problem Areas

Areas of common problems can be found in the responses of the presidents. The seriousness of these problem areas would vary from situation to situation, of course, but it would be likely that any college in the process of senate making would have to face them. Chief among them would be:

1. Who will be members? (How can "competent, courageous concerned" faculty be enlisted?)
2. What will be the structural framework?
3. What will be the relationships with the Faculty, the Board, the Administration?
4. What will be the purposes?
5. What will be the procedures?
6. What role will the senate play?
7. How can the senate be made an important, viable component of the college organization?

Later, considerable attention will be directed to the manner in which these questions were answered in the case study senates. Now, the ways in which these questions were answered throughout the state are described.

Membership in the Senate

Constitution makers would have to decide which persons from among the many categories of positions in the college would be eligible to run for the position of senator. The universal practice seems to be to make the base qualification that of full-time, tenured instructor. Beyond that, variability exists. There is, however, an almost universal disposition to exclude administrators, part-time instructors, and part-time evening instructors. Classified staff and students are universally excluded. Table 7 reports the percentages of colleges that deem the various categories eligible.

TABLE 2

ELIGIBILITY TO RUN FOR SENATOR
(N=52)

Category	No.	%
Full-time, tenured	49	95
Full-time, non-tenured	35	67
Department chairman, elected	18	35
Department chairman, appointed	25	48
Counselors	38	73
Librarians	39	77

Structure of the Senate

The principal options in structuring the senate are: (1) senate of the whole, with no representative body; (2) senate of the whole, with an elected representative body; and (3) representative senate.

The prevailing decision has been to set the senate up as a representative body. The incidence of each type is reported in Table 8.

TABLE 3

SENATE STRUCTURE
(N=53)

Type	No.	%
Entire faculty is considered to be the senate, or senate of the whole	6	11
"Senate of the whole," with a council or executive committee of elected representatives	7	13
Senate is elected body of representatives	36	68
Other	4	8

Although the representative senate type has predominated, it appears that there was some controversy on the matter of choosing between the representative form and the senate of the whole form. Almost half of the presidents said that the question was not an issue of importance during

constitution making, but 22 per cent responded that it was an important issue, and 20 per cent stated that it was an issue, but not important.

For the purposes of representation, a twofold constituency scheme appears to be common practice, by which one class of senators is elected "at large," and another is elected from departments, or divisions, along subject-matter lines.

Purposes of the Senate

ACR 48 and Sec. 131.6 sketched in the broad purposes of an academic senate as: "to make recommendations," to "meet and confer," and "to provide a formal and effective procedure for participation in the formation of district policies on academic and professional matters." These purposes are vague in statement, and have lent themselves to local interpretation. As might be expected, senates vary in conception of purpose.

The purposes of a senate may be sorted into two categories. One, the formal or constitutionally stated purposes, and two, the informal, extra-constitutional purposes. Responses by academic senate presidents to questionnaire items as well as an examination of constitutions indicate that in broad outlines, purposes generally rest on the mandates of ACR 48 and Sec. 131.6 as a starting point. Evidence also shows that local circumstances have worked at individual colleges to tincture statements of purpose in

distinctive and varying shades. Some senates appear to have exploited the flexibility inherent in the mandates while others have taken them literally and interpreted them narrowly.

One literal interpretation is seen in the president's response, "Following Title 5, we make recommendations to the administration and Board of Trustees on professional and academic matters." Another president wryly reports that the purpose of his senate is to "discuss, advise. This amounts to a glorified debating society."

Most senates appear to have projected a larger sense of purpose than that of being confined to a consultative role on a narrowly defined range of topics. One constitution characterized this by giving as the purposes of the senate:

1. To work for the general welfare of San Diego Mesa College, its faculty and its students.

2. To foster a sense of responsibility among faculty for maintaining a superior level of instruction and professional activity.

3. To cooperate with other organizations to improve the status of junior college education in California, as one of the three segments of higher education, especially with respect to matters directly affecting faculty.[21]

Another college stated the purposes of its senate as follows:

1. To provide the teaching faculty with a formal and effective voice in the development of educational policy;

---

[21]San Diego Mesa College, Constitution.

2. to promote and encourage high professional and academic standards among all faculty members in the performance of their primary duties as instructors;

3. to promote professional and ethical conduct among all faculty members;

4. to promote effective communication and freedom of expression within the teaching faculty and among all of its members;

5. to provide the president of the college with a representative body of the teaching faculty which can assist him in all policy matters affecting the welfare of the college;

6. to provide the administration with a democratic means for ascertaining the consensus of the teaching faculty concerning all academic and professional matters.[22]

Purposes and goals are also stated in preambles. One preamble which characterizes the broad interpretation of a senate's purpose and the kind of goals it can help the college attain stated:

> We, the Faculty of Cerritos College, in order to insure the proper exercise of the rights and privileges of our profession, to discharge the responsibilities and obligations of the trust which we share with other institutions of higher learning and to promote excellence of instruction, research, and community service, do hereby establish, within the guarantees granted and the limitations set forth by the legislature of the State of California and the Governing Board of this College District, this Constitution of the Faculty Senate of Cerritos College.[23]

---

[22]Gavilan College, Gilroy, California, Constitution.

[23]Cerritos College, Norwalk, California, Constitution.

Extra-constitutional purposes of senates were expressed by presidents. Recurrent in their comments is a characterization of the purpose of the senate as a counterweight to administration, suggesting that in the day-to-day operation of the college a paramount purpose of the senate is to make known the presence of the faculty, and if needed, to provide a mechanism for the mobilization of opinion to be brought to bear on administration.

Comments made by presidents that depict the sense of senate purpose as a counterweight are:

> To represent the faculty in all matters that may upgrade the college.
>
> - - -
>
> To be a voice of total faculty in formation of college policy.
>
> - - -
>
> To concern itself with any or all matters of concern to faculty.
>
> - - -
>
> To make recommendations to the administration concerning matters relevant to the academic community--to act as a bargaining agent with administration.
>
> - - -
>
> We are trying to have a voice in college development, curriculum development; conditions of employment and other inter-faculty, inter-administration relations. We want a voice in everything. Period.
>
> - - -
>
> A stated goal of the year was to ensure, if necessary, enforce, faculty-administrative cooperation, without reference to which group may be the reluctant ones.

The purposes of the senate, then, may be stated formally in the constitution, or expressed in extra-constitutional terms. The fundamental purpose is to give faculty a voice in policy formation and decision making. The kinds of purposes cited here, however, reveal only in part the range of purposes a senate might serve, as will be discussed later.

Reflections on the Metaphor "Voice of the Faculty"

In discussing the purposes of the senate, a metaphor that by repetition stays in the mind of the student is "Voice of the Faculty." It is interesting to explore some of the implications of this commonplace, yet emotionally loaded term. One of the strongest justifications advanced for the senate is that it would provide the faculty with a "voice." The appeal is used as a self-evident truth, and the propriety of a faculty having a "voice" is taken as a given. The metaphor suggests that faculty interests can, and will, orchestrate into a "voice," which would be heard in the dialogues attending decision making. Where would a "voice" be effective? Apparently, it is premised, in an organizational context in which there is a convention of information exchange and civil discourse, and in which evidence and reason can persuade.

Sixty-four per cent of the presidents reported that their constitutions, standing rules, or by-laws incorporated

a specification that approximated the formula "The senate speaks for the faculty." However, in response to the question, "Should the senate be specified as the 'voice of the faculty'?" at the time of the establishment of the senate, 36 per cent responded that it was an important issue, and an additional 24 per cent said that it was an issue, although not important. These responses might suggest that at the outset there was some hesitancy in assigning this role to the senate. The hesitancy is also reflected in the reluctance of faculties to accord too much latitude to the senate in interpreting the "voice" of faculty, as will be reported later.

Upon reflection, it would appear that the metaphor, "voice of the faculty," is a kind of rallying cry, connotated with a high purpose and rectitude that puts right reason and self-evident truth on the side of faculty participation. As such, it is a compelling slogan useful for the animation of the initial campaigns to establish a senate. What the metaphor fails to provide, however, are answers to vexing problems in the actual operation of a senate: On what matters shall the senate speak? How can discordant voices be harmonized into a single voice? What discretion is accorded the senate and its officers in interpreting the "voice" of the faculty? Does the metaphor of "voice" (implying ordered argument, evidence, persuasion) cast the senate in a petitioner's role? These questions and others lie concealed in the easy rhetoric of "faculty voice," and constitute

the source of much of the ongoing tensions in senates as they seek to find ways of giving tongue to the "voice" while still maintaining the approbation of the faculty.

Procedures

A delicate problem facing the constitution makers was to determine how much and what kind of procedural provisions should be incorporated in the constitution. Too much detail would surely impede the operations of the senate, as Honer argued.[24] Conversely, too little would raise fears among faculty that the senate might take on excessive autonomy. As will be shown in the case study senates, formal stipulations concerning procedure must be stated to the satisfaction of the electorate, but at the same time, operational procedures have a way of emerging to shape themselves around the social and political realities of the college in a pragmatic way.

In codifying regulations on senate procedures in constitutions, by-laws, and standing rules, the tendency has apparently been toward the minimizing of formal stipulations. Table 9 reports the responses of the senate presidents on the existence of formal provisions pertaining to six procedural "for instances."

---

[24]Stanley M. Honer, "Faculty Power and Participation," Junior College Journal, XXXVI, No. 5 (February, 1966), 28-32.

TABLE 4

RESPONSES OF SENATE PRESIDENTS TO THE QUESTION: "WHAT PROVISIONS ARE IN YOUR CONSTITUTION, BY-LAWS, STANDING RULES FOR THE REGULATION OF SENATE PROCEDURES?"

	There is this provision		There is a similar, but not identical, provision		There is no provision for this	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
That no position or action taken by the senate may go into effect until it has been publicized and a specified period of time has elapsed. (N=52)	11	22	9	17	32	62
That the faculty may rescind a senate vote by a faculty referendum. (N=52)	18	35	10	19	24	46
That senators must consult their constituencies for voting instructions on substantive matters. (N=49)	4	8	7	14	38	78
The specification that the senate "speaks for the faculty." (N=51)	22	43	13	25	16	32
A delineation of which matters the senate may or may not consider. (N=51)	9	18	11	22	31	60
That the senate president, or senate representative, is authorized to interpret the faculty position at board meetings. (N=52)	22	42	14	27	16	31

Procedures of Concern to Faculties

In the early debate on the establishment of senates, it had been argued that once in operation, senates might evolve procedures and practices that would become sources of concern to their faculties. Senate presidents were asked to assess the extent of faculty concern over selected "for instances" that portrayed senate procedures gone awry. As reported in Table 10, the responses of the presidents suggest that few find their faculties evidencing very great concern on the examples given.

TABLE 5

SENATE PRESIDENTS' JUDGMENTS ON SENATE PROCEDURES AND PRACTICES THAT CONCERN THEIR FACULTIES

	Of great concern		Of concern		Of little concern		Of no concern	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
That the senate act too independently of the faculty (N=50)	1	2	14	28	27	54	8	16
That the control of the senate fall into the hands of a group of the faculty (N=51)	3	6	14	28	22	43	12	23
That the senate not be able to act quickly and responsibly (N=52)	2	4	20	38	21	40	9	17
That the senate become overly concerned with detail and lose sight of the big picture (N=52)	0	0	17	33	26	50	9	17

Operating procedures. The tendency appears to be that parliamentary procedures are absorbed, usually by designating Roberts' Rules of Order as a procedural framework. The concepts of majority rule, debate, committee reports, presiding officers, are virtually universal, indicating that faculties responded, much as their cultural background would suggest, by making their senates essentially political entities.

Models for Senate Making

Although many faculty members had had ample experience in the ways and means of organized activity within their departments, faculty associations, and professional organizations, the concept of the academic senate was a novelty to many. Upon what would a senate best be modeled? Because a compelling argument in ACR 48 was the appeal to the traditions of governance in higher education, it might be expected that senates would be greatly influenced by the models of university and state college senates. Such, however, does not appear to be the case, as Table 11 shows.

TABLE 6

MODELS INFLUENTIAL IN DEVELOPMENT OF SENATE STRUCTURE AND PROCEDURES

	Very influential		Moderately influential		Not influential	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
The model of university academic senates (N=50)	7	14	17	34	26	52
The model of state college academic senates (N=50)	7	14	24	48	19	38
The model of other junior college academic senates (N=50)	17	34	19	38	13	26
The model of faculty organizations (N=50)	14	28	16	32	20	40
The model of conventional legislative processes (N=48)	15	31	23	48	10	21

Opinions of Senate Presidents on the Role of the Senate in the Governance of the College

An important question is, What should be the role of the senate in the governance of the college? Presidents were asked to give their opinions on possible roles of the senate in relationship to the administration. Their responses, reported in Table 12, may be interpreted to show a pronounced tendency to see the senate in a strong role, but not one that dominates administration. The "sounding board only" role is rejected by 76 per cent. The "limited advisory and

recommendation role" is rejected by 70 per cent. At the same time, 94 per cent disagreed with the statement that "[the senate] should ultimately replace most college administrators."

TABLE 7

OPINIONS OF SENATE PRESIDENTS ON THE QUESTION, "WHAT DO YOU FEEL SHOULD BE THE ROLE OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE IN THE TOTAL GOVERNMENT OF THE COLLEGE?"

	Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
It should be only a "sounding board for the expression of faculty opinion (N=52)	6	12	7	13	15	29	24	46
It should have a limited advisory and recommendation role (N=50)	8	16	7	14	16	32	19	38
It should ultimately replace most college administrators (N=52)	1	2	3	6	23	44	25	48
It should make the important policy decisions for the college, the implementation of which would be the role of administration (N=52)	17	33	11	21	19	37	5	9
It should work directly with the Board in making decisions (N=52)	12	23	24	46	10	20	6	11
It should become the leader and final authority in making decisions at the college level (N=47)	3	6	15	32	19	40	10	21

Senate's role in leadership. More specifically, presidents were asked to give their opinions on the desirability of certain relationships between the administration and the senate in respect to leadership. As the responses reported in Table 13 show, the preferred relationship was one of partnership and shared authority. The relationship in which the administration is in a "housekeeping" role and the senate is the leader was decisively rejected. This rejection should dispel the belief held by some that the ultimate objective of faculties is to use their senates to "take over" the administration of the college.

TABLE 8

OPINIONS OF SENATE PRESIDENTS ON THE RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN ADMINISTRATION AND ACADEMIC SENATES

	Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Administration's role should be one of leadership, while the academic senate provides advice and recommendations (N=46)	7	15	15	33	12	26	12	26
Administration's role should be one of partnership and shared authority with the senate (N=49)	25	51	18	37	4	8	2	4
Administration's role should be one of "housekeeping" while the senate provides leadership (N=45)	2	4	5	11	19	42	19	42

Conclusion and Implications

A buildup of pressures for enlarged faculty participation was behind the enactment of ACR 48 and Section 131.6. Upon their passage, much of the pressure was diverted to the academic senate movement. Subsequently, senates became virtually ubiquitous components of junior college governance, recognized by the resolution of JCAP, as a "regular part of the operation of the college."

Generically, the label academic senate can be applied accurately to a distinguishable class of organizations. They have in common their strong constitutional-political flavor, representative in nature, with dual constituency schemes, and with purposes that revolve around being the "voice of the faculty."

At the same time, local circumstances have worked to create variability among senates within this generic class. The variability is seen in structural differences, procedures, and the degree of power and authority they exercise within their own college context.

It is likely that the processes of constitution making were an important prelude to the actual initiation of the senate. Several key processes were in operation during this phase, which could have a strong influence on the ultimate viability of the senate. One process would be that of obtaining the affirmation of legitimacy for the senate from the

faculty. The vote to establish a senate would be only the authorization to propose a senate, not an approval of a specific senate. Thus, the process of legitimation of senates compelled the constitution writers to present a constitution that would meet with the approval of the preponderance of the faculty. By ratification, in a sense a form of "compacting," or "covenanting," the senate gains an indispensable legitimation from the "body politic."

Another process would be that of education. What a senate could be, or should be, would have to be projected and explored, and a consensus gathered behind the conceptualization. In a sense, the process of educating faculty, administrators, and even boards during the process of constitution writing would be an important prelude to the actual operation of the senate.

Further, an important process that would continue for the life of the senate would begin during the constitution writing. This would be the ongoing process of animating the senate, according it life and character. A kind of "tuning up" would continue formally through constitutional revisions, and informally through the hardening of precedents, evolution of traditions, habits of operation, grooving of channels of communication, evolving an internal social structure, and the carving out of a role, or roles, within the overall framework of the college organization.

APPENDIX

TABLE 9

PREDICTIONS OF SENATE PRESIDENTS CONCERNING ACADEMIC SENATES, DEPARTMENTS, AND PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

	Certain to occur		Likely to occur		Unlikely to occur		Will not occur	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Academic senates will be bypassed while departments become the more effective channel for faculty participation (=48)	1	2	2	4	32	67	13	27
Senates will become more ineffective while professional organizations take up the major role in representing the vital interests of the faculty at the college level (N=50)	2	4	3	6	24	48	21	42

TABLE 10

AREAS OF COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENT AND CONCERN, STATE-WIDE

Areas	No.	%
Academic freedom and professional ethics	39	82
Academic policies	38	79
Long-range goals; institutional philosophy	31	65
Student personnel policies	30	62
Salary for instructional personnel	24	50
Budget planning	21	42
Faculty social activities	16	34
Policies and procedures for selection of administrative personnel	13	28
Selection of administrative personnel	13	28
Evaluation of instructors and professional competence of instructors	10	21
Selection and dismissal of instructional personnel	10	21
Evaluation of administrative personnel and practices	7	15

TABLE 11

PREFERENCES BY FACULTIES AND STATE-WIDE PRESIDENTS FPR TUE "STYLE" OF THE SENATE PRESIDENT

Styles	Merritt		Laney		Diablo Valley		State-wide	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
An academic senate is best served by a president who is assertive, directive, and runs the meetings in strict accordance with Parliamentary procedure	77	66	59	75	79	69	18	37
An academic senate is best served by a president who is flexible, nondirective, and runs the meetings in such a way as to let discussions take their own course	40	34	20	25	35	31	31	63

TABLE 12

PREFERENCES EXPRESSED BY THE THREE COLLEGE FACULTIES AND STATE-WIDE PRESIDENTS ON THE ROLE OF THE SENATOR

	Merritt		Laney		Diablo Valley		State-wide	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
The academic senate is best served by the senator who sees his role as that of an "instructed" delegate of his faculty and his constituency	74	62	40	51	55	47	13	27
The academic senate is best served by the senator who sees his role as a representative who is free to use his own judgment	46	38	38	49	63	53	35	73

TABLE 13

PREDICTIONS OF THE FACULTIES OF THE THREE COLLEGES AND STATE-WIDE PRESIDENTS ON THE STATEMENT: "SERVICE AS A SENATOR WILL BECOME A CONVENTIONAL STEPPING-STONE TO ADMINISTRATIVE POSITIONS"

	Merritt (N=116)		Laney (N=77)		Diablo Valley (N 109)		State-wide (N=51)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Certain to occur	7	6	1	1	3	3	-	-
Likely to occur	41	35	22	29	18	16	5	10
Unlikely to occur	49	42	39	51	65	60	29	57
Will not occur	19	17	15	19	23	21	17	33

TABLE 14

PREDICTIONS OF THE THREE COLLEGE FACULTIES AND STATE-WIDE SENATE PRESIDENTS ON THE STATEMENT: "THE STATUS OF SENATOR WILL BE INCREASINGLY IMPORTANT AND SOUGHT AFTER BY FACULTY MEMBERS

	Merritt (N=118)		Laney (N=70)		Diablo Valley (N=101)		State-wide (N=50)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Certain to occur	11	9	6	9	5	5	9	18
Likely to occur	62	53	22	31	34	34	34	68
Unlikely to occur	40	34	36	51	54	53	5	10
Will not occur	5	4	6	9	8	8	2	2

TABLE 15

RESPONSES OF FACULTY AND STATEWIDE PRESIDENTS TO THE PREDICTION: "ACADEMIC SENATES WILL BECOME DOMINATED BY OLIGARCHIES"

	Merritt (N=117)		Laney (N=76)		Diablo Valley (N=110)		State-wide (N=50)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Certain to occur	12	10	7	9	7	6	1	2
Likely to occur	39	33	29	38	31	28	4	8
Unlikely to occur	53	45	34	45	61	56	35	70
Will not occur	13	12	6	8	11	10	10	20

TABLE 16

SENATE PRESIDENTS' JUDGMENTS ON THE APPROPRIATENESS OF CERTAIN TOPICS AS SENATE BUSINESS

Topics	Clearly Approp.		Not Sure It Is Approp.		Not Approp.	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Pay scales for student employees of the college (N=52)	9	17	15	29	28	54
Procedures and policy for selection of administrative personnel (N=53)	36	68	12	23	5	9
Policy governing the "W" grade for student withdrawals from classes (N=53)	38	72	10	19	5	9
Complaints concerning the cafeteria food and service (N=52)	16	31	20	39	16	30
Resolutions to state officials concerning state educational policies (e.g., financial support, tuition) (N=53)	47	89	5	9	1	2
Evaluation of instructors for retention and dismissal (N=52)	29	55	11	21	12	23
Plans for administrative reorganization (N=53)	40	75	10	19	3	6
Setting curricular requirements for certificate programs in the technical-vocational areas (N=53)	24	45	20	38	9	17

TABLE 17

PREFERENCES OF FACULTY MEMBERS AMONG CHANNELS FOR MAKING INFLUENCE FELT IN POLICY FORMULATION AND DECISION MAKING

	First Choice			Last Choice		
	Merritt	Laney	Diablo Valley	Merritt	Laney	Diablo Valley
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Senate channels	44	26	20	3	8	9
Departmental channels	57	60	64	2	6	2
Professional organization channels	1	7	8	77	55	57
Administrative channels	9	24	15	16	24	28

TABLE 18

ATTITUDES OF FACULTY MEMBERS TOWARD THEIR SENATE AND ITS ACTIVITIES

	Merritt (N=129)		Laney (N=82)		Diablo Valley (N=129)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Strongly approve	70	54	26	32	56	43
Approve somewhat	39	30	36	44	51	40
Do not approve, or disapprove	5	4	12	14	17	13
Disapprove somewhat	9	7	7	9	5	4
Disapprove strongly	6	5	1	1	-	-

TABLE 19

OPINIONS OF THE THREE COLLEGE FACULTIES ON THE DEGREE OF FREEDOM THE SENATE SHOULD HAVE IN SPEAKING FOR THE FACULTY

	Merritt (N=129)		Laney (N=83)		Diablo Valley (N=125)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Complete freedom, using its judgment to interpret the feelings of the faculty	15	12	8	10	14	11
Limited freedom, using its judgment, but subject to formal regulations which allow time for faculty to consider and vote approval or disapproval of a senate decision	95	74	50	60	88	70
Closely limited freedom, in which the senate may formulate a position, but a vote of the total faculty is necessary before a position is considered official	19	14	25	30	23	9

TABLE 20

ATTITUDES OF HIGH SCHOOL EXPERIENCED AND NON-HIGH SCHOOL EXPERIENCED FACULTY MEMBERS TOWARD THE SENATE AND ITS ACTIVITIES

	Merritt				Laney				Diablo Valley			
	High School Experienced (N=16)		Non-High School Experienced (N=113)		High School Experienced (N=22)		Non-High School Experienced (N=60)		High School Experienced (N=38)		Non-High School Experienced (N=91)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Strongly approve	11	69	59	52	8	36	18	30	18	47	38	42
Approve somewhat	4	25	35	31	9	41	27	45	16	42	35	39
Do not approve or disapprove	1	6	4	4	3	14	9	15	4	11	13	14
Disapprove somewhat	-	-	9	8	2	9	5	8	-	-	5	5
Strongly disapprove	-	-	6	5	-	-	1	2	-	-	-	-

TABLE 21

ATTITUDES OF LIBERAL ARTS AND TECHNICAL-VOCATIONAL FACULTY MEMBERS TOWARD THE SENATE AND ITS ACTIVITIES

	Merritt				Laney				Diablo Valley			
	Liberal Arts (N=92)		Technical-Vocational (N=28)		Liberal Arts (N=46)		Technical-Vocational (N=28)		Liberal Arts (N=94)		Technical-Vocational (N=30)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Strongly approve	52	57	13	46	20	44	4	14	46	49	8	27
Approve somewhat	25	27	12	43	16	35	16	57	37	39	12	40
Do not approve or disapprove	4	4	1	4	6	13	5	18	8	8	9	30
Disapprove somewhat	6	7	2	7	4	8	2	7	4	4	1	3
Strongly disapprove	5	5	-	-	-	-	1	4	-	-	-	-

TABLE 22

ATTITUDES TOWARD THE SENATE AND ITS ACTIVITIES BY TENURED AND NON-TENURED FACULTY MEMBERS

	Merritt				Laney				Diablo Valley			
	Tenured (N=85)		Non-tenured (N=18)		Tenured (N=36)		Non-tenured (N=31)		Tenured (N=70)		Non-tenured (N=46)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Strongly approve	47	56	6	33	10	28	11	35	28	40	20	44
Approve somewhat	23	27	9	50	15	42	14	45	27	39	19	41
Do not approve or disapprove	2	2	2	11	7	19	3	10	11	15	6	13
Disapprove somewhat	7	8	1	6	3	8	3	10	4	6	1	2
Strongly disapprove	6	7	-	-	1	3	-	-	-	-	-	-

TABLE 23

PREFERENCES OF FACULTY MEMBERS ON THE QUESTION, "WHOM WOULD YOU CHOOSE TO EVALUATE YOUR INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE?"

	First Choice			Last Choice		
	Merritt	Laney	Diablo Valley	Merritt	Laney	Diablo Valley
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Faculty senate committee	6	5	6	22	29	36
Committee of colleagues from your department	76	51	71	1	-	-
Your department chairman	20	30	22	1	7	6
Administrative committee	8	17	6	13	12	16
An administrator	1	12	3	58	35	35

TABLE 24

PREFERENCES FOR THE UTILIZATION OF FREE TIME BY FACULTIES OF THE THREE COLLEGES

Activities	Preferences (in per cent)					
	Merritt		Laney		Diablo Valley	
	1st 2nd	6th 7th	1st 2nd	6th 7th	1st 2nd	6th 7th
Write an article	52	21	33	33	41	17
Course work in own field	76	5	80	1	64	13
Work on an administrative committee	5	41	20	25	10	24
Work on departmental committee	38	7	61	4	60	3
Work in professional organization	14	33	16	16	21	24
Become an active senator	31	20	15	29	24	24
Become senate officer	12	56	6	72	19	53